

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated September 9, 2004, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 14, 15, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 5,986,774 (Han); claims 1, 7, 17 and 19 were rejected under § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 5,251,072 (Fukuoka); claims 3, 12 and 13 were rejected under § 103 over Han in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,467,172 (Liao); and claim 16 was rejected under § 103 over Fukuoka. Newly added claims 23-37 are readable on the elected specie I.

With respect to claim 1, Han does not disclose connecting a mating coupler on a media adapter to a coupler on an imaging device to mechanically couple the media adapter to the imaging device, in combination with establishing a signal link between the mating coupler on the media adapter and the imaging device. In Han, magnets on a transparency adapter 54 (magnets 56 and 58 as depicted in Figure 2 of Han) are provided to enable positioning of the transparency adapter 54 with respect to a carriage 50 that has corresponding magnets 66 and 68 to interact with the magnets 56 and 58 of the transparency adapter 54. There is no signal link established between the magnets of the transparency adapter 54 and magnets of the carriage 50. Power is provided through a power cord 64 to the transparency adapter 54 (see Figure 2 of Han). In other words, Han describes the use of a power cord to deliver power to a transparency adapter, and does not disclose establishing a signal link between the *mating coupler* of the media adapter and the imaging device. In fact, as conceded by the Office Action, the recited signal link is “not shown” in Han. 9/9/2004 Office Action at 2.

Han also fails to disclose that the media adapter has a slot to receive a media object. The media object of Han is in the form of a transparency 52 placed on the glass platen 24, with the transparency adapter 54 passing over the transparency 52 (see Figure 2 of Han). In fact, according to Han, a “gap 74 is provided to be of such a height so as to permit sliding movement of the transparency adapter 54 over the transparency and *without touching* the transparency”. Han, 4:65-5:1 (emphasis added). Han clearly does not teach a media adapter to receive a media object – Han teaches the complete opposite, that the media object (transparency 52) does not even touch the media adapter.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 is not anticipated by Han.

It is also respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by Fukuoka, which also fails to disclose receiving a media object inside a media adapter. Fukuoka depicts a transmission read light source unit 20 that has a fluorescent lamp 22. Fukuoka, 3:36-37. However, there is no teaching of the light source unit 20 receiving a media object, as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over Fukuoka.

Newly added independent claim 34 is similarly allowable over Han or Fukuoka, since neither discloses a media adapter having a slot to receive a media object.

Claim 3 has been amended from dependent form to independent form, and now recites delivering electrical power to the media adapter over a signal link (established between the mating coupler of the media adapter and the imaging device) to the imaging device, *and* delivering control signals between the media adapter and the imaging device over the signal link. Claim 3 was rejected as being obvious over the asserted combination of Han and Liao. As discussed above, Han discloses the delivery of power through a power cord 64 to the transparency adapter 54 – therefore, Han fails to disclose the delivery of either control signals or electrical power through the couplers (in the form of magnets) in the Han scanner. Liao similarly discloses the use of a power cord 24 to deliver power to a transparency adapter (see Figure 2 of Liao). There is no teaching whatsoever of establishing a signal link between the mating coupler on the media adapter and the imaging device, and delivering electrical power and control signals between the media adapter and the imaging device over such a signal link. Thus, even if Han and Liao can be properly combined, the hypothetical combination of Han and Liao does not teach or suggest *all* elements of claim 3. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 3. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143 (8<sup>th</sup> ed., Rev. 2), at 2100-129.

Independent claims 7 and 19 are similarly allowable over the cited references. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims.

In view of the allowability of generic claims 1, 7, and 19, rejoinder of withdrawn claims 6, 18, and 22 is respectfully requested.

Appln. Serial No. 10/650,529  
Amendment Dated November 8, 2004  
Reply to Office Action Mailed September 9, 2004

Allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 (200209277-1).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Nov 8, 2004

  
Dan C. Hu  
Registration No. 40,025  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
Telephone: (713) 468-8880  
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883